1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO 3 WESTERN DIVISION 4 5 6 ERIC L. JEFFRIES, 7 Plaintiff, CASE NO. 8 vs. C-1-02-351 9 CENTRE LIFE INSURANCE CO., et al., 10 Defendants. 11 12 13 14 Deposition of: NEWTON H. BULLARD, M.D. 15 Pursuant to: Subpoena and Notice 16 Date and Time: Friday, April 18, 2003 2:40 p.m. 17 Place: Graydon, Head & Ritchey 18 511 Walnut Street 1900 Fifth Third Center 19 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 20 Reporter: Patti Stachler, RMR, CRR Notary Public - State of Ohio 21 22 23 24 25

- 1 service of an independent medical examiner for a party
- 2 in litigation?
- 3 A. Occasionally.
- 4 Q. Have you previously served any lawyer at the
- 5 Wood & Lamping law firm in that capacity?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. Have you previously performed that function
- 8 on behalf of any insurance company?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Have you been asked to perform that function
- 11 in the context of workers' compensation claims or other
- 12 types of claims?
- 13 A. With respect to your question --
- 14 Q. Yes, sir?
- 15 A. -- concerning workman's compensation, the
- 16 answer is no.
- 17 Q. Okay.
- 18 A. With respect to other claims, the answer is
- 19 yes.
- 20 Q. Okay. But not previously for any insurance
- 21 company and not previously for any lawyer at the Wood &
- 22 Lamping law firm?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. So Mr. Burrell has not ever asked for
- 25 your assistance -- your professional assistance on any

- 1 Q. Have you testified as an expert in those
- 2 matters?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. Can you give me a general range as to how
- 5 many depositions there may have been previously?
- 6 A. Probably less than 20.
- Q. Okay. So you've had some experience with
- 8 lawyers in depositions, and there's something about the
- 9 Jeffries case that Mr. Burrell communicated to you
- 10 during that first call that was not appealing. What
- 11 was it about his characterization of the assignment
- 12 that did not appeal to you?
- 13 A. It wasn't clear that if he was asking me for
- 14 an expert opinion based on a background in infectious
- 15 disease or a background in rheumatology or a background
- 16 in vaccine-related difficulty, that my ability to
- 17 testify would be a benefit to him.
- Q. Am I sensing that what you're saying is there
- 19 might be some subspecialty or other type of specialized
- 20 physician that would have been more appropriate based
- 21 on the description you were given?
- 22 A. No.
- 23 Q. Okay.
- 24 A. The question was, if he --
- Q. Mr. Burrell's question?

- 1 Mr. Burrell's part that the way -- the way he described
- 2 the assignment to you was not appealing to you. And so
- 3 he asked you to reconsider, based on the slightly
- 4 different description of what he was looking for. Is
- 5 that close to what happened?
- 6 A. Or the second call improved my understanding
- 7 of what he had said the first time that I had
- 8 misunderstood. The end result was that by the end of
- 9 the second call, I felt that there was an issue that
- 10 they would like to have me review that I felt
- 11 comfortable in reviewing and providing an opinion.
- 12 Q. What did you understand that issue to be?
- 13 A. My understanding of that, I was to review the
- 14 information that had -- was supplied to me concerning
- 15 Mr. Jeffries, that I was to examine the patient and to,
- on the basis of my clinical experience as a practicing
- 17 physician, provide an overview assessment of the
- 18 situation.
- 19 Q. To review the information that was provided
- 20 to me. As of that moment in time, you had not been
- 21 provided any documents regarding Mr. Jeffries?
- 22 A. My recollection is that that is the case.
- 23 Q. Okay.
- 24 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 70 was marked for
- 25 identification.)

- 1 you told Mr. Burrell you could do.
- 2 A. Let me rephrase that.
- 3 Q. Okay.
- 4 A. I indicated that I thought that I could
- 5 perform an examination which might be helpful in terms
- 6 of clarifying their understanding of the patient's
- 7 situation.
- Q. What do you mean by helpful to them?
- 9 A. At the time that I reviewed the records,
- 10 there were large numbers of contrasting opinions that
- 11 had been accumulated over the course of this patient's
- 12 medical condition. There seemed to be distractions
- 13 involved at every level which might have been missing
- 14 the illness of the patient.
- 15 Q. So before -- were you done?
- 16 A. (Nodding head.)
- 17 Q. So before actually visiting with
- 18 Mr. Jeffries, you had concluded, based on your review
- 19 of the documents that were given to you, that there
- 20 were a large number of contrasting opinions?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Okay. Was it your belief on reviewing the
- 23 records that there are opinions that Mr. Jeffries is
- 24 not disabled? How do you mean contrasting, I guess is
- 25 my question?

- 1 you will repeat it.
- Q. Okay. The repeat part would be that I asked
- 3 you whether, after reviewing the records, you concluded
- 4 that you had the capacity to assimilate all the records
- 5 and then in conjunction with an actual examination of
- 6 Mr. Jeffries clarify the situation for the
- 7 defendants?
- 8 A. It wasn't clear to me that they had,
- 9 Mr. Burrell and his associates, had any need for
- 10 clarification of their understanding, necessarily. I
- 11 think they were looking for a better insight into the
- 12 situation. And that by reviewing the patient's
- 13 situation, the data and his examination, that I might
- 14 be able to provide a different perspective.
- 15 Q. Let me back up a little. Twice now you've
- 16 said that there were, quote, contrasting opinions.
- 17 What opinions in the file are contrasting?
- 18 A. My recollection is that there were a number
- 19 of documents that had been produced by physicians that
- 20 indicated one -- that a particular symptom was related
- 21 to something. A different physician indicating that
- 22 that symptom could not have been due to whatever the
- 23 first physician said. Differences in diagnoses. There
- 24 were -- there was a litany of different diagnoses and
- 25 different explanations of the patient's conditions.

- 1 A. Would you --
- 2 (The record was read.)
- 3 BY MR. ROBERTS:
- 4 Q. And what was your understanding of their
- 5 interest in you seeing the patient?
- 6 A. My understanding was that they were looking
- 7 for a global assessment from a general practitioner
- 8 experienced in seeing patients on a day-to-day basis to
- 9 assess my objective feeling as to this individual's
- 10 illness and current condition.
- 11 Q. Okay. I know you had those two initial calls
- 12 with Mr. Burrell and then you had this meeting with
- 13 Mr. Burrell. Are there any other conversations you had
- 14 with Mr. Burrell before seeing Mr. Jeffries?
- 15 A. I honestly don't recall any.
- 16 Q. Okay. Any time prior to seeing Mr. Jeffries
- 17 did you speak to Mr. Ellis, other than this
- 18 face-to-face conference that you've shared with me?
- 19 A. No.
- Q. On the phone or in person?
- 21 A. Not that I recall.
- Q. Okay. Can you recall any other detail of
- 23 this less-than-an-hour meeting with Mr. Burrell and
- 24 Mr. Ellis face to face in your office?
- 25 A. No.